

Appl. No. : 10/719,416
Filed : November 21, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 28-31 are pending. Claims 1-14 and 28-31 stand rejected. Claims 15-27 have been cancelled. This is not a surrender of the claimed subject matter and Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter in a related application. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that both an inner surface and an outer surface of each wall have a pitch that points in the same direction as the pitch of the wall. Claims 3, 4, 8, and 9 have been amended in light of the amendment to Claim 1. Claim 28 has been amended to recite that the surfaces of the segments that face an exterior of the chamber form an exterior angle of more than 180°. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification and claims, for example, Figures 1 and 3; paragraphs 0010, 0012, and 0022-0025; and Claims 12, 15, 17, 22, and 29.

Applicant thanks Examiner Moore for the helpful telephone interview conducted on March 1, 2006 between Applicant's representatives, Eli Loots and Sabin Lee, and the Examiner. During the discussion, the fact that the two primary references (Mahawili and Kordina) do not teach or suggest a reaction chamber with an upper or lower wall that has segments that are slightly out of parallel so as to form a tent-shaped enclosure was discussed. It was noted that the segments of the walls are arranged to form the pitch, and that this distinguishes the claimed invention from the cited art. While the term "plate" was discussed in the interview, the Examiner noted that a more descriptive amendment could demonstrate the above described properties without requiring one to review the specification. Applicant has amended the two pending independent claims accordingly.

Claims 28-30 are novel over Mahawili

As discussed in the interview, Mahawili (U.S. Pat. No. 4,834,022, hereinafter "Mahawili") teaches a "z plate" 46 which is attached to a wall 37 of the reaction chamber. While the inner side of the z plate contains an angled section, the back surface of the z plate is not angled and is actually connected to a structure 37 that is planar on both sides.

In contrast, current Claim 28 recites that at least one of the upper or lower walls has two flat, angled segments that have surfaces that face an exterior of the chamber that form an exterior

Appl. No. : 10/719,416
Filed : November 21, 2003

angle of more than 180°. As is clear from FIG. 1 of Mahawili, the surface of the exterior of Mahawili's chamber, for both the z plate and the top plate 37, are not angled (*i.e.*, 180°). Thus, Mahawili does not teach each element of Claim 28 and cannot anticipate Claim 28. Claims 29 and 30 recite additional distinguishing features and depend from novel Claim 28. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-14 and 31 are nonobvious over Kordina in combination with the other cited references

Kordina et al. (U.S. Pat. No 5,695,567, hereinafter "Kordina") forms the basis of the rejection of Claims 1-14. Kordina has been asserted as teaching the general structure of the claimed reaction chamber. However, Kordina does not teach a reaction chamber that comprises:

a chamber upper wall and a chamber lower wall that each comprise two, flat rectangular segments that are slightly out of parallel such that each of said chamber upper wall and said chamber lower wall has a pitch, wherein both an inner surface and an outer surface of each wall have a pitch that points in the same direction as the pitch of the wall, and wherein the pitches of the upper and lower walls point away from each other.

For example, while the external surfaces of the upper and lower walls of Kordina's reaction chamber are pointed in opposite directions, the interior surfaces are not similarly pitched. In contrast, amended Claim 1 recites that the inner surface of each wall has a pitch that points in the same direction as the pitch of each wall. As such, Kordina does not supply each element of the general structure of the reaction chamber as claimed. Additionally, the other cited references do not teach these elements either. As all of the elements have not been taught by the cited references, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed. Additionally, because the dependent claims recite additional inventive aspects, and because they depend from nonobvious Claim 1, they are also nonobvious.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 31, as noted above, Mahawili does not teach each element of Claim 28, from which Claim 31 depends. None of the other cited references teaches the above claimed element (*e.g.*, an exterior angle of more than 180 degrees). As such, not all of the elements of Claim 28 have not been taught and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to Claim 28 or dependent Claim 31.

Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Appl. No. : 10/719,416
Filed : November 21, 2003

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and request the same. If, however, some issue remains that the Examiner feels can be addressed by Examiner Amendment, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned for authorization.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 3/13/02

By: 

Eli A. Loots
Registration No. 54,715
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(415) 954-4114

2385296
021706